

REMARKS

The Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of the application in view of the remarks made herein.

Formal Matters

Claims 3-10 and 13-17 have been amended to remove multiple dependencies.

Claims 1-17 are pending after entry of the amendments set forth herein.

As the above amendments introduce no new matter, their entry by the Examiner is respectfully requested.

Claim Objections – 37 CFR 1.75(c)

Claims 4-10 and 14-17 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being in improper form because a multiple dependent claim cannot depend from any other multiple dependent claim.

Applicants have amended the claims to be in proper dependent form.

In light of these amendments, withdrawal of the objection under 37 CFR 1.75(c) is respectfully requested.

Claim Rejections – 35 USC §102

Claims 1-3, 11-13 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by Schwartz et al. ("Schwartz", U.S. 2005/0039139). Specifically, the Office alleges that Schwartz et al. discloses a linked two-paned user interface and a computer system which anticipates the claimed invention.

For a rejection of claims under §102 to be properly founded, the Office must establish that a single prior art reference either expressly or inherently discloses each and every element of the claimed invention. *See, e.g. Hybritech Inc. v. Monoclonal Antibodies, Inc.*, 231 USPQ 81 (Fed. Cir. 1986), *cert. denied*, 480 U.S. 947 (1987); and *Verdegaal Bros. v. Union Oil Co. of California*, 2 USPQ2d 1051, 1053 (Fed. Cir. 1987). In *Scripps Clinic & Research Found. v. Genentech, Inc.*, 18 USPQ2d 1001 (Fed. Cir. 1991), the Federal Circuit held that:

“Invalidity for anticipation requires that all of the elements and limitations of the claim are found within a single prior art reference.... There must be no difference between the claimed invention and the reference disclosure, as viewed by a person of ordinary skill in the field of the invention.” *Id.* at 1010.

Anticipation cannot be found, therefore, unless a cited reference discloses all of the elements, features or limitations of the presently claimed invention. Applicants respectfully traverse the rejection and submit that Schwartz et al. fails to teach all of the elements of claims 1-3 and 11-13.

Independent claim 1 is drawn to a device comprising a memory and processing unit for displaying information on at least one screen and includes the element of “choosing means for choosing a displayed display area and/or screen in which the further information relating to the selected information object will be displayed”. Independent claim 11 is drawn to a method for determining a second display area and includes the steps of “displaying choosing means; choosing a display area and/or screen in which the further information relating to the selectable information object will be displayed; displaying the further information in the chosen display area”.

The Applicants respectfully submit that Schwartz does not teach these “choosing means” elements of the claimed invention. The “choosing means” elements as claimed are described throughout the specification (e.g., see Figures 3 and 4, and the specification on page 7 at lines 30-34).

The Office alleges that the “choosing means” elements of the claimed invention are disclosed in paragraphs [0027], [0054] – [0056] and in Figures 7- 9, of the Schwartz reference.

Paragraph [0027] of Schwartz discloses a “linked, two-paned interface for selecting and administering objects” using a design that “logically and visibly separates the selection and administration workflow from the user’s point of view” and “the UI may allow the user to view a list of objects, create a new instance of an

object, administer an existing object, or delete an object”. A “selection” window allows the user to perform an action on an object or set of objects and the “administration” window displays “all the properties of the selected object, allows that object to be changed, and allows changes made by the user to be either saved or cancelled”.

The Applicants respectfully submit that the “linked, two-paned interface for selecting and administering objects” discussed in paragraph [0027], does not teach “a choosing means for choosing a displayed display area and/or screen”. The user interface as claimed is distinct from the two-paned user interface asserted in Schwartz because after selecting an object in the claimed invention, the user is prompted by a “choosing means” (screen-like context menu) and must **choose** which frame/window to display the information related to the selected object. Schwartz discloses a two-paned user interface for the “selection” and “administration” of objects, but does not teach the step of choosing where information about the objects will be displayed.

Similarly, the Office asserts that the “choosing means” elements are disclosed in paragraph [0055] and Figure 8 of Schwartz which “illustrates a select/administer UI for electronic assets. The UI includes an asset selection window 800 and an asset administration window 802”.

As argued above, the Applicants submit that the “select/administer UI for electronic assets” discussed in paragraph [0055] and illustrated in Figure 8 does not teach the “choosing means” elements as claimed. Window 800 and 802 of Figure 8 are linked such that information inputted into the “Asset Administration” window 802 will be displayed in window 800. Likewise, selection of an object in “Select an Asset” window 800 brings up the information for that object (asset) in window 802. An object selected in either window results in the display of information in a **predetermined** window. Thus, the user interface in Schwartz illustrated by Figure 8 and described in paragraph [0055], does not teach the “choosing means” elements of the claimed invention.

The Office further alleges that the “choosing means” elements of the claimed invention are illustrated by Figure 7 and in paragraph [0054]. In Figure 7, two different computers each show a selection window containing a selectable object 402 and an administration window showing an attribute 404 of the selected object 402. The Applicants submit that although the two computers show the same attribute 404 of the selected object 402, and changes in the attribute 404 saved on one of the computers will be reflected on the other computer, Schwartz does not disclose that upon selecting an object, the user is presented with a choice of display areas (windows and/or screens) for displaying the further information relating to the selected object.

The Office also asserts, that “the step for displaying the choosing means comprises steps for displaying a context menu” is disclosed in Schwartz by Figure 9, and in paragraph [0056]. Schwartz discloses in paragraph [0056] an “interface for selecting and administering a workstation” and this “allows the user to add an asset to the list of assets associated with the workstation”. Schwartz also notes that selection window **800** which is displayed after a user “has clicked an ‘Add’ button **902**” allows the user to change, delete or input information into one of the current windows.

The Applicants submit that there is no teaching in Schwartz where a user is presented with a choice to determine where information related to a selected object is to be displayed. Rather, the use of selection window **800** asserted in Schwartz prompts the user to input information that will appear in a **predetermined** window. In the example shown in Figure 9, the input of an “asset” into selection window **800** results in this information being displayed in window **608** which contains the lists of assets associated with the workstation.

Thus, the Applicants submit that Schwartz fails to teach the “choosing means” element of the claimed invention.

Accordingly, since Schwartz does not teach each and every element of Claims 1-3 and 11-13, the Applicants respectfully request withdrawal of this rejection.

CONCLUSION

In view of the arguments above, Applicants submit that all of the claims are in condition for allowance, which action is requested. If the Office finds that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, please telephone Bret Field at (650) 327-3400.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any underpayment of fees associated with this communication, including any necessary fees for extensions of time, or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 50-0815, order number ARSI-014.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 3, 2008

By: /Bret E. Field, Reg. No. 37,620/
Bret E. Field
Registration No. 37,620

BOZICEVIC, FIELD, & FRANCIS, LLP.
1900 University Avenue, Suite 200
East Palo Alto, CA 94303
USA
Telephone: (650) 327-3400
Facsimile: (650) 327-3231

F:\DOCUMENT\ARSI\014\ARSI-014 (ARSI-014) Resp to Non-Final OA of 08-04-08.doc